

RACHEL G. CONOVER

IBLA 83-641

Decided August 30, 1983

Appeal from decision of Nevada State Office, Bureau of Land Management, declaring unpatented mining claims abandoned and void. N MC 18877 and N MC 18878.

Affirmed.

1. Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976: Recordation of Affidavit of Assessment Work or Notice of Intention to Hold Mining Claim--Mining Claims: Recordation

Under sec. 314 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976, 43 U.S.C. § 1744 (1976), the owner of a mining claim located on public land must file a notice of intention to hold the mining claim or evidence of performance of assessment work on the claim prior to Dec. 31 of each year. There is no provision for waiver of this mandatory requirement, and where evidence of assessment work is not filed timely, because it was lost in the mail, the consequence must be borne by the claimant.

APPEARANCES: Rachel G. Conover, pro se.

OPINION BY ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE HENRIQUES

Rachel G. Conover appeals from a decision of the Nevada State Office, Bureau of Land Management (BLM), dated April 7, 1983, which declared the unpatented Flower #1 and #2 lode mining claims, N MC 18877 and N MC 18878, abandoned and void because evidence of annual assessment work for 1982 was not filed with BLM on or before December 30, 1982, as required by section 314 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (FLPMA), 43 U.S.C. § 1744 (1976), and 43 CFR 3833.2-1.

Appellant states that she thought her assistant had mailed the proof of labor to BLM after recording it in Lander County, Nevada, in September 1982.

[1] Section 314 of FLPMA, and the implementing regulations, 43 CFR 3833.2-1(a) and 3833.4(a), require that evidence of assessment work for each

year be filed with the proper office of BLM on or before December 30 of each calendar year, under penalty of a conclusive presumption that the claim has been abandoned if the documents are not timely or properly filed.

Although appellant thinks that the document was actually mailed to BLM in September 1982, the regulations define "file" to mean "being received and date stamped by the proper BLM office." 43 CFR 1821.2-2(f), 43 CFR 3833.1-2(a). Thus, even if there was loss of the envelope by the Postal Service, that fact would not excuse appellant's failure to comply with the cited regulations. Hughes Minerals, Inc., 74 IBLA 217 (1983); Regina McMahon, 56 IBLA 372 (1981); Everett Yount, 46 IBLA 74 (1980). The Board has repeatedly held that a mining claimant, having chosen the Postal Service as his means of delivery, must accept the responsibility and bear the consequence of loss or untimely delivery of his filings. Hughes Minerals, Inc., *supra*; Regina McMahon, *supra*; Everett Yount, *supra*. Filing is accomplished only when a document is delivered to and received by the proper BLM office. Depositing a document in the mails does not constitute filing. 43 CFR 1821.2-2(f). The filing requirement is imposed by statute, and this Board has no authority to waive it. Lynn Keith, 53 IBLA 192, 88 I.D. 369 (1981).

Appellant may wish to consult with BLM about the possibility of relocating these claims.

Accordingly, pursuant to the authority delegated to the Board of Land Appeals by the Secretary of the Interior, 43 CFR 4.1, the decision appealed from is affirmed.

Douglas E. Henriques
Administrative Judge

We concur:

Anne Poindexter Lewis
Administrative Judge

Will A. Irwin
Administrative Judge

